

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claims 1-40 stand rejected. Claims 1-10, 12-17, 20-26, 28, 30-33, and  
3 35-40 are amended. Claims 1-40 remain pending. In view of the foregoing  
4 amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

5 **SPECIFICATION**

6 Applicants amended the specification, beginning on page 2, adding a  
7 section entitled "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" as required by the  
8 Examiner. Applicant has also amended the paragraph beginning on page 8, line  
9 through page 10 line 4 to include Application numbers as required by the  
10 Examiner.

11 Applicants amended the title as suggested by the Examiner and assert that  
12 pertinent statutes and rules do not require amendment of the Background section  
13 to include "parsing of audio and video contents".

14 Applicants respectfully assert that the term "filter graph" is defined in the  
15 incorporated US Patent No. 5,913,038 and, therefore, need not be further clarified  
16 in the abstract.

17  
18 **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 101**

19 Claims 1-17, 20-23 and 35-40 stand rejected as non-statutory subject  
20 matter. Applicants respectfully traverse. The rejected claims recite one or more  
21 of the terms "media", "video content", "audio content", which represent pre-  
22 computer process activity. For example, the media/content can represent digital  
23 electronic signals of a scene recorded by a video camera, which represents pre-  
24 computer process activity. Further, independent claim 1 is amended recite" to be  
25

1 implemented on a computer system” in the preamble, and claim 35 is amended to  
2 recite “when executed by a machine”.

### 3 **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

4 Claim 28 stands objected to for informalities. Claim 28 is amended to  
5 correct the informalities.

### 6 **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112**

7 Claims 28, 30, 32 stand rejected as non-enabled. Applicants respectfully  
8 traverse. Claim 28 is enabled by at least p. 66, lines 5-11 of the application.  
9 Claim 30 is enabled by at least p. 67, lines 17-20 of the application. Claim 32 is  
10 enabled by at least p. 66, lines 16-20 of the specification.

11 Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 13, 15, 16 and 72 stand rejected as indefinite. In view of  
12 the amendments to these claims, Applicants assert that these claims are definite to  
13 one of ordinary skill in the art. For example, claims 1 have been amended to  
14 correct antecedent basis problems regarding the term “media type”. Claim 2 is  
15 amended to replace “exposed from” with the broader term “made available by .  
16 Claim 5 is amended to recite “of processing of the media content” to more clearly  
17 define *what* was completed by each of the media processing systems. Claims 6-7  
18 are amended to correct antecedent basis problems regarding the term “source  
19 chain”. Claim 13 is amended to delete “in some fashion”. To improve clarity,  
20 claims 15 and 16 are amended to recite “virtual” before the terms “input pin” and  
21 “output pin”. To improve clarity, claim 32 is amended to recite “source filter  
22 chains” instead of “source filter strings”.

### 23 **REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103**

24 Claims 1, 18-26, and 33-35 stand rejected as being obvious in view of the  
25 combination of Griffith and Wu. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims

1 are patentable over the cited references because they have been amended to  
2 include or originally included a recitation of “*single instance* of a source” or  
3 “*single instance* of a multimedia source”. Applicants respectfully assert that the  
4 cited combination of Griffiths and Wu do not teach or suggest this feature. In  
5 particular, the Office Action acknowledges that Griffiths does not mention parsing  
6 audio and video contents, but then cited Wu as teaching “a CPU for parsing the  
7 audio compressed data and the video compressed data from the MPEG  
8 compressed data, and a memory controller is used to arbitrate the access priority of  
9 each of the modules over the data bus for accessing the memory.” However, this  
10 cited teaching does not address how media processing subsystems of Griffiths  
11 access media content from a single instance of the source. Assuming that the  
12 asserted combination of Griffiths and WU is replacing the splitter transform filter  
13 of Griffiths with the above-described CPU/Memory Controller of Wu,  
14 implementing all the other filters according to Griffiths will still result in multiple  
15 instances of the source. Therefore, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest  
16 the “single instance” feature as recited in the rejected claims.

17 Claims 21-24 and 37 also stand rejected as being obvious in view of the  
18 combination of Griffith and Wu. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims  
19 are patentable over the cited references because each is dependent from claim 20  
20 or claim 35, which as described above, are patentable over the combination of  
21 Griffith and Wu.

22 Claims 2-6 and 25-26 also stand rejected as being obvious in view of the  
23 combination of Griffith and Wu. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims  
24 are patentable over the cited references because each is dependent from claim 1 or  
25

1 claim 20, which as described above, are patentable over the combination of  
2 Griffith and Wu.


3 Claims 7-17, 27-32 and 36-40 are rejected as being unpatentable over  
4 Griffiths and Wu and further in view of Hunt. Applicants respectfully assert that  
5 these claims are patentable over the cited references. More particularly, Hunt is  
6 cited *inter alia* as teaching "relative priority ranking", "probability factor" and  
7 "time cost factor". However, none of Hunt's teachings as cited in the Office  
8 Action overcome the deficiencies of Griffiths and Wu, described above.  
9 Therefore, independent claims 1, 20 and 35 are also patentable over Griffiths, Wu  
10 and Hunt. Accordingly, because each of claims 7-17, 27-32 and 36-40 are  
11 dependent from claims 1, 20 or 35, these dependent claims are also patentable  
12 over Griffiths, Wu and Hunt.

13 **CONCLUSION**

14  
15 In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully  
16 requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

17 Respectfully Submitted,

18  
19 Dated: 6/21/04

20 By:  Reg # 42,222 for LEL  
21 Lawrence Lycke  
22 Reg. No. 38,605  
23 (206) 315-4001 x 103

24 Attachment:

25 Appendix with Drawing Replacement Sheets (8)